

DRAFT

HONOLULU HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT CORRIDOR PROJECT

Section 106 Consultation – Historic Hawaii Foundation

Historic Hawaii Foundation offices, Dole Cannery
1:30 p.m. June 18, 2008

Attendees: Lawrence Spurgeon, ~~and~~ Stephanie Roberts (PB),
~~Susan Robbins (InfraConsult), Bruce Nagao, (DTS)~~
Kierste~~in~~ Faulkner (HHF),
Ann Yoklavich, Dee Ruzicka, ~~and~~ Wendy Wichman (Mason
Architects)_____

Ms. Faulkner explained the role and interest of Historic Hawaii Foundation in the Section 106 consultation process ~~which, for the organization, is for preservation purposes only.~~

Mr. Spurgeon gave a summary of the project's progress from the Alternatives Analysis (AA) phase to current ~~stage, noting~~and how alternatives were eliminated from further analysis. He stated that the project has not submitted ~~inventory forms for~~ concurrence for eligibility with the State Historic Preservation Department (SHPD) at this time; however, the project is working closely with SHPD at this time. ~~Maps and lists of the inventoried parcels have been given to SHPD, plus staff input has been obtained by driving the alignment portions with them.~~ He discussed the reasoning for alternatives to be eliminated through the AA process, including the possible tunneling through the downtown area. He then detailed what the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) will cover in regard to study limits and a definition of the First Project. It was stated that that focus of the document is on the First Project area with the extensions being studied for cumulative effects now. However, the extensions would be fully studied at a later date as the overall project progresses. Maps of the alignment were then handed out.

Ms. Faulkner asked why the system could not be at grade through the downtown area on existing streets. Mr. Spurgeon explained the project's reasoning for an elevated guideway through the downtown area.

The maps were then discussed along with ~~how~~ the methodology of how the historic resources were inventoried. Ms. Yoklavich explained the various steps that were used to investigate and identify potential and existing historic properties. ~~In response to a question from Ms. Faulkner about the data source for property dates Ms. Yoklavich explained She stated that some tax-exempt properties were also included had dates on database lists provided by the City, and that if undated properties were observed to have older buildings, they were also included in the inventory. that were used.~~ The Area of

Potential Effect (APE) was discussed and was identified as one-lot deep along the corridor and one-block in radius around stations (except in area with undefined blocks which were defined as a 500-foot radius). Mr. Spurgeon explained that though the guideway has shifted that the shifting was within several feet and would not impact the current APE.

The discussion turned to the Kaka'ako and Dillingham station areas. Mr. Spurgeon explained that the guideway would be in the median when possible; however, the median would need to be widened in some areas and where there is no existing median there would be straddle bents.

~~It was~~Mr. Spurgeon stated that it would be a few months before SHPD would need to give concurrence on the eligibility of proposed historic properties. In response to a question from Ms. Faulkner, ~~H~~he stated that a cultural landscape assessment is not a part of the project, but noted that there are ~~some~~the street tree plantings along Dillingham ~~that may were inventoried and will~~ be affected. Ms. Yoklavich noted that some other cultural landscapes, including watercress farms at Pearl Ridge and adjacent to the Ewa Junction maintenance site option were inventoried, but that the former sugarcane fields (now unused or in other crops) were not.

Ms. Faulkner asked about cultural resources, visual impacts and viewplains, street trees, and burials. She was told that these are all being studied. ~~She was answered that these are all being~~evaluated as part of the DEIS. She then asked about negative effects on historic resources and was answered that not every effect will be considered a negative effect ~~and~~. Mr. Spurgeon noted the project is working closely with SHPD but it is currently in the very early stages of consultation. It was also stated that the project will base some of their possible determinations of effect on what the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has done in other areas. ~~Lastly, she~~Ms. Faulkner also inquired about other parties involved in Section 106 consultations. Lawrence explained that we are either in process or setting up communications with other Section 106 consultation parties at this time.

Ms. Faulkner asked if any historic buildings needed to be demolished. Mr. Spurgeon stated that some properties on Dillingham Avenue would need to be removed. Also some street trees on Dillingham would also need to be cut. She then inquired about categories of mitigation. Mr. Spurgeon responded that the project is very open to mitigation ideas including HABS/HAER reports, context studies, area surveys, and/or to create station of historic interpretive signage at stations.

~~Lastly,~~ At the end of the meeting, the timeline for the project was discussed. It was explained that the FTA will proposed ~~recommendations on~~ effects findings; however, the DEIS will not have final determinations. Determinations will be made after comments are received and further consultation with SHPD.